

212/518

Remarks

Applicant appreciates the examiners time to arrange and conduct a telephone interview with applicants counsel on January 17, 2006. The interview summary is attached.

Claims 3 through 15 remain pending in the application. Claims 3-5 and 8 are currently amended. Previously added claims 12-17 have been renumbered as noted by the examiner, and claim 16 is new.

The examiner has objected to claims 12-16 an improperly numbered. Claims 12-16 have been renumbered as claims 11-15.

Claims 3,4,7 and 14-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,778,592 to Malmberg. As amended, the fastener of independent claims 3 and 4 engages a fishing reel which supports the rod. Malmberg does not teach or suggest indirectly supporting a fishing rod by engaging and supporting the reel to which the rod is attached. Thus the rejection with respect to Malmberg is overcome.

Dependent claims 7 and 14-15 depend from claims 3 and 4 and thus the rejections with respect to claims 7 and 14-15 are overcome.

Claims 5-6 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,673,507 to Stokes. As amended, the fastener of independent claim 5 engages a fishing reel which supports the rod. Stokes does not teach or suggest indirectly supporting a fishing rod by engaging and supporting

212/518

the reel to which the rod is attached. Thus the rejection with respect to Stokes is overcome.

Dependent claims 6 and 13 depend from claim 5 and thus the rejections with respect to claims 6 and 13 are overcome.

Claims 8 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malmberg as applied to claims 3-4 above and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,088,946 to Simmons. Claims 8 and 10 depend from claims 3 and 4 and thus the rejections with respect to claims 8 and 10 are overcome as discussed above.

The Simmons reference is also overcome by the enclosed amendment. The tether of Simmons does not support a reel and thus indirectly the rod to which the reel is attached.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malmberg as applied to claim 3 above and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,485,579 to Hawie. Claim 9 depends from claim 3 and thus the rejections with respect to claim 9 is overcome as discussed above.

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malmberg as applied to claim 4 above and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,876,980 to Hawie. Claim 11 depends from claim 4 and thus the rejections with respect to claim 11 is overcome as discussed above.

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stokes as applied to claim 5 above and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,088,946 to Simmons. Claim 12

212/518


depends from claim 5 and thus the rejections with respect to claim 12 is overcome as discussed above.

Conclusion

This response has addressed all of the Examiner's objections and grounds for rejection. The rejections based on prior art have been traversed. Reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of the claims is requested.

Date: January 17, 2006

By:


Paul J. Backofen, Esq.
Reg. No. 42278